UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/724,851	12/01/2003	Robert N.C. Broberg III	03-1458/L13.12-0245	2165

7590 02/07/2008		EXAMINER
Leo J. Peters		TECKLU, ISAAC TUKU
LSI Logic Corporation		
MS D-106		ART UNIT / PAPER NUMBER
1621 Barber Lane		
Milpitas, CA 95035		2192

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/07/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 January 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4,7,9-11,13,14,16,19 and 20* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-2, 4, 7, 9-11, 13-14, 16 and 19-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the Request for Continued Examination filed on 01/16/2008.

2. Claims 1, 4, 7, 9-11, 13, 16 and 19-20 have been amended.

3. Claims 3, 5-6, 8, 12, 15 and 17-18 have been cancelled.

4. Claims 1-2, 4, 7, 9-11, 13-14, 16, 19 and 20 have been reexamined.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

5. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 01/16/2008 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for

patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for·patent by another filed in the United

States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international

application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for

purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the

international application designated the United States and was published under Article

21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7.   Claims 1-2, 4, 7, 9-11, 13-14, 16, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Dalton et al. (US 6,981,017 B1), hereinafter Dalton.

As per claim 1 (Currently Amended), Dalton discloses a process of abstracting file paths

for a plurality of design files in a computer readable language comprising steps of (e.g. FIG. 1

and related text):

a) inputting at least one description file defining file paths to the design files in a first

environment (col. 5: 45-55 "… each input file that contains a reference to a directory path in the

previous design system … " and e.g. FIG. 1, 100, 102 and FIG. 3A, 300 and related text);

b) parsing a directory structure on the system to locate the description file to identify file

paths to the description file and each of the design files (col. 4: 20-30 "… directory name is

parsed … identifies a relationship for respective line …" and e.g. FIG. 2, 206 and FIG. 3A, 302

and related text); and

c) generating an index correlating each description file and its respective file path for the

first environment (col. 3: 35-45 "… netlists are generated …" and col. 4: 35-45 "… generating

mapping file ..." and e.g. FIG. 1,106 and 108 and related text), and accessing at least one of the

design files within that directory structure by a design tool through a combination of the file

path (e.g. FIG. 3A, steps 302, 308-310 and related text – Note the design file (input file) is

accessed for parsing for each line of the design file), to the description file, identified in the

index and the file path, to the design file, defined by the description file (e.g. FIG. 2, 206 and

FIG. 3A, step 316 and related text –Note each design file that contains a reference to a directory

path in the system is modified to reference directory path in the updated system. Also software

tool identifies directory names to modify the corresponding path reference.)

As per claim 2, Dalton discloses the process of claim 1, wherein step (b) comprises:

b1) defining a directory of description files defining file paths in the first environment

(col. 2: 50-65 "... defines .. directory structure ..." and col. 5: 45-55 "... each input file that

contains a reference to a directory path in the previous design system ... "), and

b2) parsing the directory (e.g. FIG. 2, 206 and related text).

As per claim 4 (Currently Amended), Dalton discloses the process of claim2 ~~claim 3~~,

further comprising: d) before step f), constructing a list containing design file names and

respective full paths ~~through the first and second environments~~ (col. 2: 35-45 "... lines are

sorted into an ordered list based ..."e.g. FIG. 3A, 308 and related text) for each of the design

files according to step c) (e.g. FIG. 3A, steps 302, 308-310 and related text.

As per claim 7 (Currently Amended), Dalton discloses the process of ~~claim 6~~ claim 1, further comprising d) before ~~step f)~~ accessing, constructing a list containing design file names and respective full paths through the first and second environments (col. 2: 35-45 "... lines are sorted into an ordered list based ..."e.g. FIG. 3A, 308 and related text) for each of the design files (e.g. FIG. 3A, steps 302, 308-310 and related text

As per claim 9 (Currently Amended), Dalton discloses the process of ~~claim 8~~ claim1, wherein ~~the combining~~ step comprises concatenating ~~the respective file paths~~ the file path of the description file that is identified in the index to the file path of the design file defined by the description file (col. 3: 35-45 "... netlists are generated ..." and col. 4: 35-45 "... generating mapping file ..." and e.g. FIG. 1,106 and 108 and related text), and f) applying the design files to the second environment using the full file paths (e.g. FIG. 2, 202-208 and related text).

As per claim 10 (Currently Amended), this is the process for applying a design file version of the claimed process discussed above (Claims 1 and 3), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Dalton.

As per claim 11 (Currently Amended), this is the process for applying design file version of the claimed process discussed above (Claim 4), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Dalton.

As per claim 13 (Currently Amended, this is the computer usable medium version of the claimed process discussed above (Claim 1), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Dalton.

As per claim 14 (Currently Amended), this is the computer usable medium version of the claimed process discussed above (Claim 2), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Dalton.

As per claim 16 (Currently Amended), this is the computer usable medium version of the claimed process discussed above (Claim 4), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Dalton.

As per claim 19 (Currently Amended), this is the computer usable medium version of the claimed process discussed above (Claim 7), wherein all claim limitations have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Dalton.

As per claim 20 (Currently Amended), Dalton discloses the computer usable medium of claim 13, wherein the computer readable program code for causing the computer to

concatenating the file path of the description file that is identified in the index to the file path of the design file, defined by the description file.

Response to Arguments

8.   Applicant's arguments filed 01/16/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the Remark, the Applicants argue:

In Dalton, design files are migrated from one directory structure to another structure, not accessing the design files by a design tool within the same directory structure (page 7).

Examiner's Response:

Even if Dalton design files are migrated from one directory structure to another structure each input file/design file that contains a reference to a directory path in the previous design system is modified to reference directory paths in the new or updated design system. More particularly, the software tool identifies directory names in the user script to modify the corresponding path references (col. 5:45-55 and e.g. FIG. 3A, steps 302, 308-310 and related text – Note the design file (input file) is accessed for parsing for each line of the design file).

Conclusion

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Isaac T. Tecklu whose telephone number is (571) 272-7957. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 9:300A - 8:00P.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Isaac Tecklu

Art Unit 2192

ERIC B. KISS
PRIMARY EXAMINER